

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-14 and 16-38 are all the claims pending in the application.

I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 29 and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lahey et al. (US 6,587,217).

A. Claim 29

Claim 29, as amended, recites the feature of an archiving unit operable to archive the plurality of the print data files into a file after the printing apparatus changes a name of one print data file of the plurality of the print data files to a specified name, the one print data file being a Top Page print data file, and the specified name being a predetermined name for allowing the printing apparatus to identify a print data file as the Top Page print data file. Applicants respectfully submit that Lahey does not disclose or suggest at least the above-noted feature recited in claim 29.

Regarding Lahey, Applicants note that this reference discloses a printing management system having a plurality of client computers 4a-4c, an InfoPrint Multiple Printer Controller (MPC) server 6, and an InfoPrint library 36 (see Fig. 1; col. 4, lines 28-33; and col. 5, lines 19-25). As disclosed in Lahey, each of the client computers 4a-4c has installed therein InfoPrint Submit software 10 which allows a user to create and submit a job ticket, wherein the job ticket maintains information on print attributes and the location of the print files which comprise the print job (see col. 4, lines 44-47 and col. 5, lines 51-53).

As explained in Lahey, a user is able to create a job ticket via a graphical user interface

(GUI) 60 by entering information into different fields and selecting specific options presented therein (see col. 7, lines 50-53). In this regard, as disclosed in connection with Fig. 8 of Lahey, via the GUI 60, a user is able to open a previously created job ticket (Open), create a new job ticket (New), save a job ticket the user has modified (Save or Save as), or submit the job ticket to the InfoPrint MPC server 6 for printing (Submit Job) (see col. 8, line 61 through col. 9, line 5).

As further disclosed in Lahey, a user can store job tickets and the associated files in the InfoPrint library 36 by selecting an Archive function displayed in the Ticket submenu 80 (see Fig. 8 and col. 14, lines 1-3). In this regard, as explained in connection with Fig. 14 of Lahey, if it is determined that a user has requested to archive a job ticket (step 166), a database index is created describing the parameters of the job ticket and the files referenced therein (step 168), and the job ticket and related files are stored in a subdirectory of the InfoPrint library 36 (step 172) (see col. 14, lines 20-31).

As noted above, claim 29 has been amended to recite the feature of an archiving unit operable to archive the plurality of the print data files into a file after the printing apparatus changes a name of one print data file of the plurality of the print data files to a specified name, the one print data file being a Top Page print data file, and the specified name being a predetermined name for allowing the printing apparatus to identify a print data file as the Top Page print data file.

Regarding such a feature, Applicants note that in the Office Action, the Examiner has taken the position that the above-noted ability in Lahey for a user to save a job ticket that the user has modified (e.g., Save as) corresponds to the claimed feature of the printing apparatus changing

a name of one print data file to a “specified name” (see Office Action at page 3).

With respect to such a position, Applicants note that while a user of Lahey is able to save the job ticket with a desired name, that this desired name is not a predetermined name for allowing the InfoPrint MPC server 6 to identify the file as a job ticket. In other words, Applicants note that because the name of the job ticket can be freely chosen by the user, it is clear that the name of the job ticket in Lahey is not a predetermined name, and that the name of the job ticket is not used to allow a printing apparatus to identify the file as a job ticket.

As such, Applicants submit that Lahey does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious at least the above-noted feature recited in amended claim 29 of an archiving unit operable to archive the plurality of the print data files into a file after the printing apparatus changes a name of one print data file of the plurality of the print data files to a specified name, the one print data file being a Top Page print data file, and the specified name being a predetermined name for allowing the printing apparatus to identify a print data file as the Top Page print data file.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that amended claim 29 is patentable over Lahey, an indication of which is kindly requested.

B. Claim 30

Claim 30, as amended, recites the feature of an archiving unit operable to archive one print data file of the plurality of the print data files in a specified position in an archived file, the one print data file being a Top Page print data file, and the specified position being a predetermined position for allowing the printing apparatus to identify a print data file as the Top

Page print data file. Applicants respectfully submit that Lahey does not disclose or suggest at least this feature of amended claim 30.

With respect to Lahey, as described above, a user is able to store job tickets and the associated files in the InfoPrint library 36 by selecting an Archive function displayed in the Ticket submenu 80 (see Fig. 8 and col. 14, lines 1-3). In this regard, as explained in connection with Fig. 14 of Lahey, if it is determined that a user has requested to archive a job ticket (step 166), a database index is created describing the parameters of the job ticket and the files referenced therein (step 168), and the job ticket and related files are stored in a subdirectory of the InfoPrint library 36 (step 172) (see col. 14, lines 20-31).

Thus, in Lahey, while the job ticket and related files are stored in a subdirectory of the InfoPrint library 36 when an Archive function is selected, Applicants respectfully submit the job ticket is not stored in specified position in an archived file, and that the job ticket is not stored a predetermined position for allowing a printing apparatus to identify a print date file as the job ticket. In other words, in Lahey, because the job ticket and related files are all stored in the same subdirectory, Applicants note that the job ticket is not stored in an archived file, and that the position in which the job ticket is stored is clearly not a predetermined position that allows a printing apparatus to identify the file as a job ticket.

As such, Applicants submit that Lahey does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious at least the above-noted feature recited in amended claim 30 of an archiving unit operable to archive one print data file of the plurality of the print data files in a specified position in an archived file, the one print data file being a Top Page print data file, and the specified

position being a predetermined position for allowing the printing apparatus to identify a print data file as the Top Page print data file.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that amended claim 30 is patentable over Lahey, an indication of which is kindly requested.

II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

A. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-11, 22-25, 31, 33, 35 and 37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parry (US 2003/0095284) in view of Lahey et al. (US 6,587,217).

Regarding claim 1, Applicants note that this claim has been amended in a similar manner as claim 29. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the archiving unit archives the plurality of the print data files into the archived file after changing a name of one print data file of the plurality of the print data files to a specified name, the one print data file being a Top Page print data file, and the specified name being a predetermined name for allowing a printing apparatus to identify a print data file as the Top Page print data file.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 29, Applicants respectfully submit that Lahey does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted feature recited in amended claim 1. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Parry does not cure this deficiency of Lahey. Accordingly, Applicants submit that amended claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested. Claims 4, 5 and 7-11 depend from claim 1 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Regarding claim 3, Applicants note that this claim has been amended in a similar manner as claim 30. In particular, claim 3 has been amended to recite that the archiving unit archives one print data file of the plurality of the print data files in a specified position in the archived file, the one print data file being a Top Page print data file, and the specified position being a predetermined position for allowing a printing apparatus to identify a print data file as the Top Page print data file.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 30, Applicants respectfully submit that Lahey does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted feature recited in amended claim 3. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Parry does not cure this deficiency of Lahey. Accordingly, Applicants submit that amended claim 3 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Regarding claim 22, Applicants note that this claim has been amended in a similar manner as claim 1 so as to recite that the plurality of the print data files are archived into the archived file after a name of one print data file of the plurality of the print data files is changed to a specified name, the one print data file being a Top Page print data file, and the specified name being a predetermined name for allowing said printing apparatus to identify a print data file as the Top Page print data file.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Parry and Lahey does not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious such a feature. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 22 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested. Claims 23-25 depend from claim

22 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Regarding claim 31, Applicants note that this claim has been amended in a similar manner as claim 1 so as to recite that the archiving unit archives the plurality of the print data files into the archived file after changing a name of one print data file of the plurality of the print data files to a specified name, the one print data file being a Top Page print data file, and the specified name being a predetermined name for allowing the printing apparatus to identify a print data file as the Top Page print data file.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Parry and Lahey does not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious such features. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 31 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Regarding claim 33, Applicants note that this claim has been amended in a similar manner as claim 1 so as to recite that the archiving step comprises archiving the plurality of the print data files into the archived file after changing a name of one print data file of the plurality of the print data files to a specified name, the one print data file being a Top Page print data file, and the specified name being a predetermined name for allowing the printing apparatus to identify a print data file as the Top Page print data file.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Parry and Lahey does not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious such features. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 33 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Regarding claim 35, Applicants note this claim has been amended in a similar manner as claim 1 so as to recite that the archiving comprises archiving the plurality of the print data files into the archived file after changing a name of one print data file of the plurality of the print data files to a specified name, the one print data file being a Top Page print data file, and the specified name being a predetermined name for allowing a printing apparatus to identify a print data file as the Top Page print data file.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Parry and Lahey does not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious such features. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 35 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Regarding claim 37, Applicants note this claim has been amended in a similar manner as claim 1 so as to recite that the plurality of the print data files are archived into the archived file after a name of one print data file of the plurality of the print data files is changed to a specified name, the one print data file being a Top Page print data file, and the specified name being a predetermined name for allowing the printing apparatus to identify a print data file as the Top Page print data file.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Parry and Lahey does not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious such features. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 37 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

B. Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parry in view of Lahey et al., and further in view of Agranat et al. (US 6,456,308).

Claim 6 depends from claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that Agranat does not cure the deficiencies of Parry and Lahey, as discussed above, with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 6 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

C. Claims 12-14, 16-21, 26-28, 32, 34, 36 and 38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parry in view of Lahey et al., and further in view of Nakatsuma et al. (US 6,115,132).

Claim 12 recites that a sequential transmission unit transmits sequentially the plurality of the print data files accompanied by information on a total number of the plurality of the print data files composing the print document and a transmitting order of the plurality of the print data files composing the print document.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has recognized that neither Parry nor Lahey discloses or suggests the above-noted feature recited in claim 12 (see Office Action at page 22). The Examiner, however taken the position that Nakatsuma cures this deficiency of Parry and Lahey. Applicants respectfully disagree.

In particular, regarding Nakatsuma, Applicants note that this reference discloses a printing system in which a client transmits job information of print data to a print server, wherein the server manages a print order in accordance with the job information (see Abstract and col. 28, lines 42-49). As explained in Nakatsuma, after a print operation is completed, the printer notifies

the server that printing has been completed, and the server then instructs the client to delete the print data (see Abstract and col. 28, lines 36-42 and 52-54).

Based on the foregoing description, Applicants note that while Nakatsuma discloses the ability for a server to manage a print order in accordance with job information that is received from client devices, that the mere ability to manage a print order does not in any way whatsoever correspond to the above-noted features recited in claim 12 drawn to print data files that are accompanied by information on a total number of the print data files composing a print document and a transmitting order of the plurality of the print data files composing the print document.

With respect to the above-noted argument, Applicants note that this argument was presented in the previous response filed on February 14, 2008. The Examiner, however, did not respond to this argument in the present Office Action. Applicants note that MPEP 707.07(f) indicates that “where applicant traverses any rejection, the examiner, should, if he or she repeats the rejection, take note of the applicant’s argument and answer the substance of it.” Thus, if the Examiner maintains this rejection, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner respond to the above-noted argument.

In addition, regarding claim 12, Applicants note that this claim recites that the printing apparatus is able to identify the Top Page print data file on a basis of the transmitting order of the plurality of the print data files. In the Office Action, the Examiner has taken the position that Lahey discloses such a feature (see Office Action at the top of page 22). Applicants respectfully disagree.

In particular, regarding the above-noted feature drawn to the ability to identify the Top

Page print data file on a basis of the transmitting order of the plurality of print data files, Applicants note that the Examiner has indicated in the Office Action that each job ticket in Lahey contains one or more document records, and that the document records include all of the information needed to print a document included in the print job (see Office Action at page 22). Applicants note, however, that the Examiner has not adequately addressed the above-noted language recited in claim 1.

For example, Applicants note that even if the Examiner's position is correct in stating that the document records in Lahey include all of the information needed to print a document included in the print job, that such disclosure does not in any way whatsoever mean that the job ticket can be identified on a basis of the transmitting order of a plurality of print data files. In other words, Applicants respectfully submit that the mere disclosure in Lahey of a document record that includes all of the information necessary to print a document, does not mean that Lahey provides the ability to identify a job ticket on a basis of the transmitting order of a plurality of print files. If the Examiner disagrees and believes that such a feature is inherent to Lahey, then Applicants request that the Examiner provided a basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to support such a position as required by MPEP 2112(IV).

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art references do not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted features recited in claim 12. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 12 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested. Claims 13, 14 and 17-21 depend from claim 12 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Regarding claim 16, Applicants note that this claim recites that a sequential transmission unit transmits the plurality of the print data files accompanied by a flag indicating a completion of the transmission, the flag being attached to one print data file to be transmitted to the printing apparatus last out of the plurality of the print data files composing the print document. In the Office Action, the Examiner has recognized that neither Parry nor Lahey discloses such a feature (see Office Action at page 25). The Examiner, however, has taken the position that Nakatsuma cures this deficiency of Parry and Lahey. Applicants respectfully disagree.

In particular, regarding Nakatsuma, as discussed above, this reference discloses that after a print operation is completed, the printer notifies the server that printing has been completed, and the server then instructs the client to delete the print data (see Abstract and col. 28, lines 36-42 and 52-54).

Thus, in Nakatsuma, while a notification is sent from the printer to the server indicating that printing has been completed, Applicants note that in direct contrast to such disclosure, claim 16 recites that the last print data file which is sent from the sequential transmission unit to a printing apparatus has a flag attached thereto that indicates a completion of the transmission of the print data files.

With respect to the above-noted argument, Applicants again note that this argument was presented in the previous response filed on February 14, 2008. The Examiner, however, did not respond to this argument in the present Office Action. Applicants note that MPEP 707.07(f) indicates that “where applicant traverses any rejection, the examiner, should, if he or she repeats the rejection, take note of the applicant’s argument and answer the substance of it.” Thus, if the

Examiner maintains this rejection, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner respond to the above-noted argument.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art references do not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted feature recited in claim 16. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 16 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Regarding claim 26, Applicants note this claim recites that the sequential acquisition unit sequentially acquires the plurality of the print data files accompanied by information on a total number of the print data files composing the print document and a transmitting order of the plurality of the print data files composing the print document, wherein the printing apparatus is able to identify the Top Page print data file on a basis of the transmitting order of the plurality of the print data files.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 12, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art references do not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious such features. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 26 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested. Claims 27 and 28 depend from claim 26 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Regarding claim 32, Applicants note this claim recites that the sequential transmission unit transmits sequentially the plurality of the print data files accompanied by information on a total number of the plurality of the print data files composing the single print document and a transmitting order of the plurality of the print data files composing the single print document,

wherein the printing apparatus is able to identify the Top Page print data file on a basis of the transmitting order of the plurality of the print data files.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 12, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art references do not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious such features. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 32 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Regarding claims 34 and 36, Applicants note these claims recite that the sequential transmission step comprises transmitting sequentially the plurality of the print data files accompanied by information on a total number of the plurality of the print data files composing the single print document and a transmitting order of the plurality of the print data files composing the single print document, wherein the printing apparatus is able to identify the Top Page print data file on a basis of the transmitting order of the plurality of the print data files.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 12, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art references do not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious such features. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 34 and 36 patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Regarding claim 38, Applicants note this claim recites that the plurality of the print data files acquired sequentially from the print data providing apparatus are accompanied by information on a total number of the plurality of the print data files composing the single print document and a transmitting order of the plurality of the print data files composing the single print document, wherein the printing apparatus is able to identify the Top Page print data file on a

basis of the transmitting order of the plurality of the print data files.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 12, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art references do not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious such features. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 38 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may best be resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Shigeki MATSUNAGA et al.

/Kenneth W. Fields/

By: 2008.09.04 14:31:50 -04'00'

Kenneth W. Fields

Registration No. 52,430

Attorney for Applicants

KWF/krq
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
September 4, 2008